DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 316 983 EC 230 039

AUTHOR VanBiervliet, Alan; Parette, Howard P., Jr.
TITLE Arkansas Technology Access Program. Summary of the Transportation Needs of Arkansans with Disabilities. Think People...Think Technology.
INSTITUTION Arkansas Univ., Little Rock. Center for Research on Teaching and Learning.
SPONS AGENCY Arkansas Governor's Developmental Disabilities Planning Council, Little Rock.; Arkansas Univ., Little Rock. University-Affiliated Program.; Michigan Interagency Committee on the Black Child, Lansing.
PUB DATE 31 Aug 89
NOTE 27p.; For related documents, see EC 230 038-042.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accessibility (for Disabled); *Assistive Devices (for Disabled); Consumer Education; Demography; *Disabilities; Needs Assessment; Public Opinion; Services; State Programs; *State Surveys; *Technology; *Transportation
IDENTIFIERS *Arkansas; Technology Access for Arkansans

ABSTRACT

The Technology Access for Arkansans project and the Planning Division of the Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department cooperated in a survey to determine the transportation needs of disabled persons in the state. Analysis of the 2,201 consumer survey forms returned (approximately 20% of those sent) is provided for the following areas: demographics (all age groups were represented and physical handicap was the most frequently self-reported disability); levels of satisfaction (61% of respondents reported they were satisfied with services related to assistive devices); areas of technology usage and unmet needs (32% reported using technology for "getting around"); travel practices (47% reported traveling 0-20 miles to receive assistive devices/services). An additional survey of approximately 2,200 professionals yielded 458 completed forms for a response rate of about 21%; this survey examined: use of or need for transportation-related technology and information (respondents expressed a need for more information concerning technology and related transportation services); provision of transportation services (almost three-fourths reported providing transportation services); expenditures for transportation services (a wide range of annual expenditures was reported); and projected 5-year replacement needs (greatest need is for vans). Attached tables detail survey responses. One reference. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED316983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Think People...
Think Technology.

SUMMARY OF THE TRANSPORTATION NEEDS OF ARKANSANS WITH DISABILITIES

Report submitted to the Division of Planning, Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department

August 31, 1989

Prepared by: Alan VanBiervliet, Ph.D.
Howard P. Parette, Jr., Ed.D.

This project was supported in part by funds from the Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department, the Arkansas Governors Developmental Disabilities Council, the University of Arkansas - UAP, and the University of Arkansas at Little Rock.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Alan VanBiervliet
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 230039

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Summary of Findings of a Survey of Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department Service Providers

Overview

Representing a cooperative effort to address the technology needs of Arkansans of all ages who have disabilities, the Technology Access for Arkansans (TAARK) project was funded by the Governor's Developmental Disabilities Planning Council (DDPC) and the University of Arkansas-University Affiliated Program. Though the scope of this project is multifaceted, one of its primary tasks was to develop a comprehensive state technology plan in response to Public Law 100-407, the *Technology Related Assistance for Persons With Disabilities Act of 1988*. In order to gain information relevant to planning purposes, it was deemed necessary to conduct a comprehensive survey of persons with disabilities in Arkansas to obtain information regarding technology issues as well as the needs of this population.

Inherent in the grant application processes of P.L. 100-407 is an emphasis upon interagency cooperation. Since it has been consistently reported in the professional habilitation and rehabilitation literature that transportation is a vital component of any technology service delivery system, contact was made with the Planning Division of the Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department (AHTD) to ascertain if there would be an interest in collaborating in an information gathering project. It was found that the AHTD was preparing to initiate its own research study to examine the transportation needs of Arkansans with disabilities. The discussions which ensued between the Planning Division of the AHTD and TAARK personnel resulted in an agreement that both parties would cooperate in an information gathering activity.

A contract was entered into between the AHTD and the TAARK project to jointly conduct a statewide survey that would yield necessary information to both parties, thereby maximizing the use of available resources and preventing duplication of research efforts. Funding for the survey and related activities was provided by AHTD with matching funds provided by the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. This summary presents the findings of the resulting surveys which targeted both consumers as well as transportation service providers.

Method

Consumer survey. Within the framework of the TAARK project is a Coordinated Planning Committee (CPC) consisting of 48 persons which included consumers, parents of persons with disabilities, representatives of persons with disabilities, and representatives of 25 different public and private agencies, including the AHTD. Each person on this committee was also a member of one of six Study Groups designed to examine technology issues in the state. One such subcomponent, the Consumer Needs Study Group, was charged with the task of designing a survey instrument to determine the technology needs of consumers with disabilities. The resulting instrument was designed with the input and approval of the entire CPC.

Mailing lists were requested from all participating agencies represented on the CPC. Groups which participated by providing mailing lists included: Advocacy Services, Arkansas Association for the Hearing Impaired, Arkansas Easter Seal Society, Central Arkansas Area Agency on Aging, Coalition for the Handicapped, Department of Human Services (DHS) Developmental Disabilities Services, DHS Division of Rehabilitation Services, DHS Division of Services for the Blind, and Mainstream Living Center, which is an independent living center funded through Title VII Part B. Approximately 10,000 mailing labels were submitted for use in the consumer survey, constituting a sample of a wide range of persons with disabilities of all ages. In order to address the elderly population of the state--a significant component of the Arkansas population base (Division of Demographic Research, 1988)--contact was made with publication headquarters for *Arkansas Aging*, a periodical of the DHS Division of Aging and Adult Services and the Arkansas Association of Area Agencies on Aging, and consent was obtained to reproduce the Consumer Survey instrument in its newspaper. This publication has a circulation of approximately 35,000 within the State of Arkansas. Consent was also obtained to reproduce the Consumer Survey in *ARC news*, a monthly newsletter disseminated by the Association for Retarded Citizens/Arkansas which has a circulation of approximately 4,000. These three sources resulted in the potential to reach approximately 49,000 Arkansans.

Return envelopes were included in the mailout of 10,000 survey instruments though no return envelopes were included in the published versions of the survey in the aforementioned

newsletters. It was recognized from the outset that this strategy would significantly affect return rates from the readership of these newsletters, yet project budgetary constraints prohibited the use of return envelopes with such a volume of mailouts. Surveys were mailed during the first week of April of 1989. To insure that the elderly sector of the state was adequately represented in the survey, a second mailout using return envelopes to six Area Agencies on Aging was conducted in June of 1989. This procedure was warranted given the poor response rate reflected subsequent to publication of the survey form in Aging Arkansas.

Professional Survey. Each participating group of the CPC was also requested to provide a mailing list of professionals involved in service delivery to persons with disabilities in their respective agency. In some instances, contacts were made with agencies/groups not directly involved in the planning activity, e.g., state occupational therapy, physical therapy, social work organizations, and copies of mailing labels secured. This process resulted in the names and addresses of approximately 2,200 professionals across the state being identified for use in the survey, representing the following agencies/groups: Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department, Advocacy Services, Arkansas Area Agencies on Aging, Arkansas Chapter of American Deafness and Rehabilitation Association, Arkansas Chapter of the American Speech and Hearing Association,Arkansas Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers, Arkansas Easter Seal Society, Arkansas Occupational Therapy Association, Arkansas Physical Therapy Association, Arkansas Rehabilitation Institute, Arkansas School for the Blind, Arkansas School for the Deaf, Arkansas Spinal Cord Commission, Association for the Hearing Impaired, Association for Retarded Citizens/Arkansas, Children's Medical Services, Coalition for the Handicapped, Department of Human Services (DHS) Division of Aging and Adult Services, DHS Division of Developmental Disabilities Services, DHS Division of Rehabilitation Services, DHS Division of Services for the Blind, and Mainstream Living.

A draft version of the Survey of Professionals instrument was prepared by the Consumer Needs Study Group and, as with the Consumer Survey, was reviewed and modified on numerous occasions by the entire CPC. Return envelopes were included in each instrument to facilitate return by recipients of the survey. The final version was printed and mailed in mid-April of 1989.

A subset of 143 AHTD-funded transit providers was included in the general mailout with

cover letters both from the Planning Division Chief of AHTD and from the TAARK office attached to each survey instrument. A second mailout to all AHTD funded transit providers who did not respond to the first mailing conducted in April was initiated in June of 1989. For those service providers who failed to respond to a second mailout, a telephone contact was made with the directors or other appropriate administrative personnel by a research assistant at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. Survey items relating specifically to transportation were obtained directly via interview technique.

Inter-data entry reliability. Data from returns were entered on computer by two project staff personnel and two work study employees who assisted in the data entry phase of the project. All records were entered on a PANORAMA (ProVUE Development Corporation, 1988) database in which a formatted screen for each section of each survey instrument was visible to data entry personnel. All data were combined into a single data base. Data entry reliability was determined by examining a random sample of 10% of the returned consumer and professional survey forms and comparing actual data entered on computer to that exhibited on the survey forms. Since data were entered in a visible screen section, or window, relating to the actual survey instrument, an error rate ranging from 0-5% for various sections, or windows, was demonstrated for the sample of consumer instruments while an error rate of 0 to less than 1% was reflected in the entry of professional survey data.

Consumer Survey Results

Demographics. A total of 2201 consumer survey forms were received as of August 10, 1989. This reflects a return rate of approximately 20% of the overall survey forms which were mailed that included return envelopes. Surveys which were disseminated via the mechanism of *Aging Arkansas* and *ARC news* were not included in data analysis due to the poor response rate that resulted subsequent to not using return envelopes.

The results of this survey which were of primary interest to the AHTD are reported in Tables 1 and 2. Examination of the survey responses indicated that representation of all counties in the state was indicated in returned survey instruments, and that the return rates from these

counties typically mirrored population densities of these counties. Also, all age groups were

represented among the survey respondents. Self reports of disability category by participants in the survey reflected a wide range of disabilities: physical handicap (46%); problems with seeing (41%); problems with learning (35%); problems with speech (32%); mental retardation (31%); problems with hearing (26%); heart problems (16%); breathing problems (13%); emotional problems (12%); head injury (6%); and other (17%).

Levels of satisfaction. Table 1 reports levels of satisfaction experienced by consumer survey respondents. A large number of respondents (61%) reported that they were satisfied with the services they received for their assistive devices. However, 51% of the respondents reported that they needed more information regarding assistive devices/services. This need for information was supported by the high number of unmet needs reported in all categories of assistive devices/services (see Table 2).

When asked if transportation services were being provided, a majority of the respondents (52%) indicated that they were not in receipt of such services, while only 35% reported having access to transportation services.

Areas of technology usage and unmet needs. Technology usage was reported in all areas of life functioning by the consumer respondents participating in the survey. Only a small percentage of the respondents (13%) indicated use of *specialized cars, vans, and buses,* though a slightly larger percentage (17%) reported an unmet need in this area. The use of technology for *getting around* was reported by 32% of those participating in the survey, with only 11% noting an unmet need in this area.

Travel practices. In the area of travel practices demonstrated by consumers, 21% (n = 452) of respondents reported that no travel was involved in order to receive assistive devices/services, though approximately one-third of these respondents (n = 161) were age 65 and above. Another group of respondents (26%) indicated traveling only 1-20 miles to receive their assistive devices/services, and 12% reported they had to travel 21-50 miles to receive such services. A large number of respondents (24%) reported having to travel over 50 miles to receive assistive devices/services.

Professional Survey Results

Demographics. A total of 458 completed professional survey forms were received as

of August 10, 1989, reflecting a return rate approximately 21%. Of the group of 143 AHTD-funded transportation service providers (AHTD group), a total of 33 completed professional survey forms from directors of facilities receiving AHTD funding were received as of August 10, 1989, indicating a return rate approximately of 23% for this subset of the total respondent class. Once telephone followups were conducted with the remaining 110 AHTD group members, data were obtained from a total of 131 service providers. Denoted in Table 3 are a listing of service providers who could not be contacted via telephone and who failed to respond to survey mailouts. Of this group of 10 agencies, 6 were deleted from data analysis for reporting purposes if they met one of three criteria: (a) no telephone listing could be obtained for the agency; (b) no information was available from anyone in the agency; or (c) no telephone response could be obtained to numerous made to the agency. This left four agencies who could not be contacted, but who, with repeated efforts over time, might well have been contacted. Thus, the study essentially examines 131 responses from 135 service providers, reflecting a return rate of 97%. Responses were received from professionals who worked with individuals representing all age ranges and disability categories. A listing of the counties that were combined into the 8 regions for data analysis purposes is presented in Table 4. Age groups which were reported being served by the respondents for the AHTD and total group respondents on a regional basis respectively are reported in Table 5. Table 6 reports a regional analysis of disability types served by professional survey respondents. It should be noted that responses were received from professionals who worked in all regions of the state.

Use of/need for transportation-related technology and need for information. The use of/need for transportation-related technology and services as well as the need for information on services and devices that was reflected in the consumer survey was also supported by the findings of the survey of AHTD-funded service providers. A regional analysis of the usage of technology and needs of clients of survey respondents is presented in Table 7. It is reported that professionals needed additional information in four areas areas of technology and related services that relate to transportation: mobility; electric/power wheelchairs; specialized cars, vans, and buses; and specialized seating. Client usage of technology services were reported by professionals in all four identified areas.

Provision of transportation services. A regional analysis of all survey respondents reporting the provision of transportation to their clients is presented in Table 8. Respondents providing transportation services outnumbered those who did not by more than 3 to 1.

Expenditures for transportation services. Reported in Table 9 are total annual expenditures for transportation on a regional basis for participants in the professional survey. Of the 131 AHTD-funded service providers who participated in the survey, a wide range of annual expenditures were reflected, ranging from $175,320 to $1,194,349, totaling $3,989,157. For the total survey sample, almost twice this amount of total expenditures were reported.

Projected 5-year replacement needs. Each respondent participating in the survey was questioned about their agency's projected needs for vehicle replacement during the next 5 years. Reported in Table 10 are regional summaries of responses regarding projected needs. As can be seen, the greatest need for the total sample in all regions is for vans, followed by adapted vans, buses, and adapted cars. Reported less frequently was the need for cars, adapted buses, and other types of vehicles, e.g., trucks. For the group of AHTD service recipients, vans and adapted vans were reported to be most needed over the next 5 years, followed by buses and adapted buses, cars, other, and adapted cars.

References

ProVUE Development Corporation. (1988). PANORAMA. Huntington Beach, CA: Author.

For further information concerning this project contact:

Alan VanBiervliet, Ph.D.
Center for Research on Teaching and Learning
University of Arkansas at Little Rock
2801 S. University
Little Rock, AR 72204
501-569-3423

Table 1

Reports of Satisfaction with Technology Services
Provided to Consumer Survey Respondents
(n = 2201)

Question	Yes	(%)*	No	%*
Were you given an evaluation before getting your assistive device?	1397	.64	296	.14
Are you satisfied with the services you receive for assistive devices you use?	1343	.61	281	.13
Did you have the opportunity to buy assistive devices/services on a "buy-on-time", or credit plan?	391	.18	1047	.46
If not, would a "buy-on-time", or credit plan help?	647	.29	501	.23
Have you received enough training in the use and care of your assistive device?	957	.44	368	.17
Were you able to try out the device before paying for it?	660	.30	559	.25
Are you satisfied with the time it takes to repair/service your device?	807	.37	318	.15
If employed, did your employer change your work area or equipment to meet your needs?	124	.06	312	.15
Do you need more information about assistive devices/services that could help you?	1121	.51	699	.32
Are transportation services being provided to you?	764	.35	1151	.52

* Percentages computed total number of respondents; rows may not total 100% due to missing data

Table 2

Areas of Assistive Devices/Services Used and Areas of Unmet Needs as Reported by Consumer Survey Respondents
(n = 2201)

Area	No. of Use	(%)*	No. of Unmet Need	(%)*
Self-Help	626	.29	305	.14
Taking Care of Home	465	.21	350	.16
Work & Work Training	317	.14	326	.15
School Training	315	.14	321	.15
Getting Around	702	.32	240	.11
Specialized Seating	278	.13	254	.12
Using a Telephone	354	.16	352	.16
Talking with Others	297	.14	341	.16
Reading, Writing, & Typing	326	.15	418	.19
Recreation	379	.17	388	.18
Things That Help You See	407	.19	294	.13
Hearing Aids & Other Hearing Devices	294	.13	306	.14
Using a Computer	161	.07	436	.20
Building Accessibility	314	.14	383	.17
Artificial Limbs, Braces, & Prostheses	261	.12	228	.10
Specialized Cars, Vans, & Buses	280	.13	375	.17

* Indicates % of total number of respondents.

Table 3

Listing of AHTD Funding Recipients Who Could Not Be Contacted or Who Failed to Respond to Mailout Survey
(N =10)

	Agency	Survey Status
*	Woodruff County Educational Center	Inaccurate address and phone number; unable to locate
	East Ashley County Day Service Center	No answer to telephone calls
	EOA's Children House	No answer to telephone calls
*	Gravey, Verbie Care Activities Center	No telephone listing
*	Autism Society of Arkansas	No telephone call return; defunct organization
*	St. Francis County Area Developmental Center	No telephone listing of agency
	Monroe County Human Development Center	Closed for summer until 8/31/89
*	Osceola Chamber of Commerce	Interviewer informed that no information is available
	Jefferson Comprehensive Care	No answer to telephone calls
*	Jackson County Learning Center	Returned van 1 1/2 years ago; no longer a recipient of AHTD funds

* **Deleted from data analysis**

Table 4

Listing of Regions and Corresponding Counties

	Regions	Counties
1	Northwest	Benton, Carrol, Boone, Marion, Baxter, Washington, Madison, Newton, Searcy
2	White River	Fulton, Izard, Sharp, Stone, Cleburne, Independence, VanBuren, White, Jackson, Woodruff
3	East	Randolph, Clay, Lawrence, Lee, Cross, Greene, Craighead, Poinsett, Phillips, Mississippi, Crittenden, St. Francis,
4	Southeast	Grant, Jefferson, Arkansas, Drew, Cleveland, Lincoln, Bradley, Chicot, Desha, Ashely,
5	Central	Faulkner, Saline, Pulaski, Lonoke, Prairie, Monroe
6	West Central	Johnson, Pope, Conway, Yell, Perry, Montgomery, Garland, Pike, Clark, Hot Springs
7	Southwest	Sevier, Howard, Little River, Dallas, Hempstead, Nevada, Ouachita, Union, Calhoun, Miller, Lafayette, Columbia,
8	Western	Crawford, Franklin, Sebastian, Logan, Scott, Polk

Table 5

Regional Analysis of Client Population Served by Professional Survey Respondents

	Age Groups											
	Infants (0 - 2)		Preschoolers (3 - 5)		School-Age (6 - 21)		Transition (16 - 21)		Adults (25 - 59)		Other Adults (60+)	
Region	Total Sample*	AHTD Group**	Total Sample*	AHTD Group**	Total Sample*	AHTD Group**	Total Sample*	AHTD Group**	Total Sample*	AHTD Group**	Total Sample*	AHTD Group**
1	53	137	101	449	230	5,743	256	2,646	493	6,290	823	5,160
2	9	26	34	79	112	2,884	23	240	3,139	3,496	6,824	7,048
3	207	319	882	1,383	2,286	5,644	1,192	1,728	2,462	4,674	2,686	3,593
4	57	65	100	443	654	3,798	34	3,735	983	10,572	699	7,513
5	1,640	6,067	1,896	6,445	6,158	21,207	1,694	8,629	1,388	24,997	2,265	87,368
6	45	78	731	979	1,713	5,198	623	2,313	2,461	6,192	903	8,586
7	76	91	141	695	69	2,546	177	777	1,777	5,106	145,311	158,373
8	16	259	46	704	30	3,604	9	329	138	2,329	2,508	5,587
TOTAL	2,103	7,042	3,931	11,177	11,252	50,624	4,008	20,397	12,841	63,656	162,019	283,228

*N = 532

**N = 131

Table 6

Regional Analysis of Disability Types Served by Agencies of Professional Survey Respondents

Region	Disability Type: Orthopedic		Multidisabilities		Visual Impairments		Speech Impairments		Hearing Impairments	
	Total Sample*	AHTD Group**	Total Sample*	AHTD Group**	Total Sample*	AHTD Group**	Total Sample*	AHTD Group**	Total Sample*	AHTD Group**
1	10,677	229	538	322	770	230	1,119	200	1,042	160
2	771	584	1,387	1,191	629	483	1,002	279	667	516
3	1,136	258	1,046	508	793	575	1,594	642	738	435
4	4,621	60	3,184	67	1,270	18	1,752	280	2,663	37
5	39,836	1,019	64,644	7,741	27,434	1,232	21,379	3,405	28,846	1,390
6	4,605	51	1,328	271	4,755	83	1,777	217	2,859	81
7	1,334	87	1,148	275	12,258	12,124	1,294	334	1,686	844
8	1,029	154	778	195	2,305	568	1,171	155	1,923	372
TOTAL	64,009	2,442	74,053	10,570	50,214	15,313	31,088	5,512	40,424	3,835

*N = 532

**N = 131

Table 6 (cont.)

Regional Analysis of Disability Types Served by Agencies of Professional Survey Respondents.

	Disability Type											
	Mental Retardation		Learning Disabilities		Behavior Disorders		Respiratory Disorders		Cardiac Disorders		Other	
Region	Total Sample*	AHTD Group**	Total Sample*	AHTD Group**	Total Sample*	AHTD Group**	Total Sample*	AHTD Group**	Total Sample*	AHTD Group**	Total Sample*	AHTD Group**
1	1,098	571	190	1,900	376	174	327	209	572	296	4	0
2	1,152	843	852	2,028	330	243	459	393	1,341	1,154	3	2
3	2,331	639	339	1,895	700	165	630	529	563	419	6	2
4	3,483	266	108	3,448	1,157	34	1,133	12	3,308	7	2	1
5	13,783	5,008	3,619	10,446	11,808	3,722	10,555	533	32,141	1,859	1,816	1
6	1,905	476	543	2,022	1,279	282	549	54	2,174	136	58	1
7	2,880	625	295	2,600	1,213	64	211	16	451	92	6	0
8	1,963	251	119	1,609	785	77	1,256	184	2,004	456	4	1
TOTAL	28,595	8,679	6,065	25,948	17,648	4,761	15,120	1,930	42,554	4,419	1,899	8

*N = 532

**N = 131

Table 7

Regional Analysis of Survey Respondents' Transportation-Related Technology Usage/Needs and Reported Needs for Information

Area of Technology Used by Clients		N Currently Used/Needed		N Needing More Information	
		AHTD Group* (%)	Total Sample** (%)	AHTD Group* (%)	Total Sample** (%)
Mobility (such as manual wheelchairs, carts, canes and crutches):					
Region	1	13 (.10)	34 (.06)	4 (.03)	9 (.02)
	2	9 (.07)	20 (.04)	2 (.02)	3 (>.01)
	3	15 (.12)	38 (.07)	2 (.02)	9 (.02)
	4	9 (.07)	35 (.07)	1 (.01)	4 (>.01)
	5	22 (.17)	112 (.21)	2 (.02)	13 (.02)
	6	10 (.08)	41 (.08)	1 (.01)	10 (.02)
	7	11 (.08)	29 (.06)	1 (.01)	2 (>.01)
	8	12 (.09)	23 (.04)	3 (.02)	6 (.01)
TOTAL		101	332	16	56
Electric/power wheelchairs and carts:					
Region	1	5 (.04)	16 (.03)	4 (.03)	10 (.02)
	2	4 (.03)	11 (.02)	2 (.02)	4 (>.01)
	3	8 (.06)	24 (.05)	5 (.04)	11 (.02)
	4	5 (.04)	23 (.05)	3 (.02)	4 (>.01)
	5	11 (.08)	75 (.14)	4 (.03)	18 (.03)
	6	6 (.05)	33 (.06)	2 (.02)	11 (.02)
	7	5 (.04)	16 (.03)	3 (.02)	6 (.01)
	8	5 (.04)	16 (.03)	3 (.02)	6 (.01)
TOTAL		49	214	26	70

*N = 532

**N = 131

Table 7 (cont.)

Regional Analysis of Survey Respondents' Transportation-Related Technology Usage/Needs and Reported Needs for Information

Area of Technology Used by Clients		N Currently Used/Needed AHTD Group*(%)	N Currently Used/Needed Total Sample**(%)	N Needing More Information AHTD Group*(%)	N Needing More Information Total Sample** (%)
Specialized cars, vans, and buses:					
Region	1	10 (.08)	29 (.06)	4 (.03)	7 (.01)
	2	9 (.07)	19 (.04)	1 (.01)	2 (>.01)
	3	15 (.12)	35 (.07)	3 (.02)	7 (.01)
	4	6 (.05)	23 (.04)	1 (.01)	4 (>.01)
	5	18 (.14)	76 (.14)	4 (.03)	31 (.06)
	6	11 (.08)	37 (.07)	0 (.00)	13 (.02)
	7	11 (.08)	24 (.05)	2 (.02)	7 (.01)
	8	9 (.07)	22 (.04)	0 (.00)	1 (>.01)
TOTAL		89	265	15	72
Specialized seating:					
Region	1	6 (.05)	25 (.05)	5 (.04)	11 (.02)
	2	8 (.06)	19 (.04)	1 (.01)	3 (.01)
	3	13 (.10)	33 (.06)	3 (.02)	8 (.02)
	4	4 (.03)	12 (.02)	4 (.03)	9 (.02)
	5	9 (.07)	71 (.13)	5 (.04)	24 (.05)
	6	5 (.04)	32 (.06)	1 (.01)	10 (.02)
	7	5 (.04)	16 (.03)	2 (.02)	8 (.02)
	8	6 (.05)	17 (.03)	3 (.02)	4 (.01)
TOTAL		56	225	24	77

*N = 532

**N = 131

Table 8

Regional Analysis of Provision of Transportation Services by Professional Survey Respondents
(N = 532)

Region	Yes	No
1	46	11
2	26	7
3	50	8
4	37	9
5	93	61
6	52	10
7	45	6
8	33	8
TOTAL	382	120

Table 9

Regional Analysis of Annual Expenditures for Transportation Services for Persons Having Disabilities*

Region	Annual Expenditures AHTD Group*	Annual Expenditures Total**
1	447,200	550,485
2	579,748	592,298
3	424,700	654,297
4	281,022	681,622
5	1,194,349	2,583,961
6	330,372	588,122
7	556,446	852,058
8	175,320	194,320
TOTAL	3,989,157	6,697,163

*N = 131

**N = 532

Table 10

Regional Analysis of Projected 5-Year Vehicle Replacement Needs

Region	N Reported Needs													
	Cars		Vans		Buses		Adapted Cars		Adapted Vans		Adapted Buses		Other	
	a*	b*	a*	b*	a*	b*	a*	b*	a*	b*	a*	b*	a*	b*
1	4	0	21	13	5	1	0	0	17	11	11	1	2	1
2	0	0	31	30	10	5	2	1	8	7	4	5	1	0
3	16	1	25	16	11	6	0	0	22	15	11	6	3	1
4	6	1	33	9	7	3	0	0	13	8	4	3	2	0
5	32	5	100	47	15	3	151	0	202	23	18	3	11	2
6	26	11	38	17	49	3	0	0	23	14	14	3	4	2
7	7	4	63	55	25	3	0	0	25	19	3	3	4	1
8	4	1	36	22	33	2	0	0	8	5	3	2	1	1
TOTAL	95	23	347	209	155	26	153	1	318	102	68	26	28	8

a* Total Sample (N = 532)

b* AHTD Group (N = 131)